

SLO Feedback Rubric

| Score | Criteria |
|-------|---|
| 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 90% - 100% of students have met their growth target. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Educator set up rigorous, superior goals(s); skillfully used appropriate assessments, continuously monitored progress; and strategically revised instruction in response to ongoing progress monitoring. |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 75% - 89% of students have met their growth targets. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Educator set up attainable goals(s); used appropriate assessments, consistently monitored progress; adjusted instruction in response to progress monitoring. |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 51% - 74% of students have met their growth targets. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Educator set up goals(s); used assessments that were not appropriate for the goal, inconsistently monitored progress; inconsistently or inappropriately adjusted instruction |
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 0% - 50% of students have met their growth targets. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Educator Inconsistently used assessments, failed to monitor progress; failed to adjust instruction based on progress monitoring data. |

Using the SLO Feedback Form:

Use this rating rubric to inform conversations in the Summative SLO Conference. The growth targets section of the SLO template is to be used for formative purposes, and influences PGDP goals for the following year.

Arriving at an overall rating for the SLO:

In the event there is discrepancy in the assessment of progress vs. process, the evaluator is to average the two scores. In the following example, the educator engaged in the process as indicated in a “3” level, but students meeting their target was at a level “2”. Overall rating is 2.5, with feedback specifically around what adjustments need to be made moving forward in order to strengthen outcomes.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 75% - 89% of students have met their growth targets. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Educator set up attainable goals(s); used appropriate assessments, consistently monitored progress; adjusted instruction in response to progress monitoring. |
| 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 51% - 74% of students have met their growth targets. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Educator set up goals(s); used assessments that were not appropriate for the goal, inconsistently monitored progress; inconsistently or inappropriately adjusted instruction |

Because the student growth measure is not being factored into an educator’s overall effectiveness rating, the score does not have to be assigned as a whole number. The district can determine if they will round to a whole number and determine criteria to do so. Those criteria should be communicated to educators in the approval conference.

Rating= 2.5

Feedback, coaching, and reflection focus on SLO planning template, and areas of needed improvement in order to strengthen the next SLO planning and approval.